

### REMARKS

The Office Action of December 4, 2006 has been carefully studied and, in view of the above changes and the following representations, reconsideration and allowance of this application are most respectfully requested.

The Examiner objects to the Abstract of the Disclosure because it contains over 150 words. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's comments and is submitting herewith a replacement Abstract that Applicant believes overcomes the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 5, and 6 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,857,346 to McLean in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,608,892 to Noizet. According to the Examiner, McLean recites all of the limitations except for the tank but believes that this is well known in the art as seen in Noizet and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified McLean by providing a substantially watertight housing as taught by Noizet in order to contain the liquids and cutting debris. Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, Applicant is submitting a terminal disclaimer herewith.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claim 5. Claim 5 has been cancelled and Claim 6 has been amended to depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1. Claims 7-12 have been cancelled. Therefore, Applicant believes that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

In view of all of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all of the claims presently in the application clearly and patentably distinguish over the references of record and should be

allowed. It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and an early action toward that end is most respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN McLEAN

By: Vanitha M. Elgart  
Vanitha M. Elgart  
Registration No. 41,445

Dated: March 5, 2007